

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,196	02/06/2004	Bernard D. Murphy	1-23868	6980
4859 7590 03/02/2007 MACMILLAN SOBANSKI & TODD, LLC			EXAMINER	
ONE MARITIME	E PLAZA FIFTH FLO		SAYALA, CHHAYA D	
720 WATER STF TOLEDO, OH 43			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
10000, 011 13	,001 101)	·	1761	
· SHORTENED STATUTORY I	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONT	rhs	. 03/02/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summers	10/774,196	MURPHY, BERNARD D.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	C. SAYALA	1761			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status		•			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_•				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the consequence of the second s	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is object.	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s)	•				
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/13/04</u>. 	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te			

Application/Control Number: 10/774,196

Art Unit: 1761

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peris et al. ("Acidification and Other Physiological Additives", CIHEAM-IAMZ, 2001, pgs. 63-70) and Ravindran et al., Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture, Volume 62, Issue 4, 1993, pages 313-322 in view of Knueven ("Sodium Bisulphate", Petfood Industry, 2000 (June), 42(6), 11-12 and US Patent 5773063).

Peris et al. and Ravindran et al. teach that acidification of weaner pig diets is beneficial. Inorganic acids, organic acids and acidic mineral salts are added so as to provide acidification for optimal pepsin activity, pH=2, in an immature stomach of a young animal. The references do not specifically teach or suggest sodium bi sulfate.

Knueven teaches the use of sodium bisulfate as an acidifier for pet food, for lowering pH, and an acid strength comparison of sodium bisulfate, with pKa values. In this regard see Knueven ('063) at col. 3, lines 8-25, which teaches the sodium bisulfate used and that shows the limitation of claim 7. Since the reference uses the same Jones-Hamilton product of bisulfate, then claim 6 limitations are inherent. The bisulfate salt is deliquescent and therefore, the addition of water as a convenient mode of delivery to the animal feed would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made. At claim 3, Knueven teaches 2-10 pounds of acid per ton of feed, and while this overlaps with 0.1-5% claimed herein, to optimize amounts within such a range depending on the age/weight of an animal would have been within the ambit of ordinary skill. The Knueven patent already teaches feeding bisulfate as an acidulant to animals, although in the form of a preservative. The primary references disclose the importance of treating a young animal with acidifiers. Therefore to feed a young animal with the bisulfate as an acidulant would have been prima facie obvious. The pKa values provided by the patent aid the skilled person in a comparison with other acidifiers so that the bisulfate acidulant can be used since it not only provides acidification but also functions as a preservative.

Page 3

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. SAYALA whose telephone number is 571-272-1405.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Application/Control Number: 10/774,196

Art Unit: 1761

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

C. SAYALA Primary Examiner Page 4

Group 1700.